

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Michael Mahaffey, #186794,
Plaintiff,
v.
Officer Brock, Officer SLRDC;
Simon Major, Jr., Director SLRDC;
Sergeant Nobles; and Mr. Sammy
Rembert, an employee of SLRDC,
Defendants.

Civil Action No. 3:07-806-SB-JRM

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon the Plaintiff's pro se complaint, which alleges violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By local rule, this matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.


On August 10, 2009, Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") analyzing the Plaintiff's complaint and recommending that the Court grant both Defendant Brock's motion to dismiss and the motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants Major, Nobles, and Rembert. Attached to the R&R was a notice advising the Plaintiff of the right to file specific, written objections to the R&R within 10 days of the date of service of the R&R. To date, no objections have been filed.

Absent timely objection from a dissatisfied party, a district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, a Magistrate Judge's factual or legal conclusions. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); Wells v. Shriner's Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 201 (4th Cir. 1997). Here, because the Plaintiff did not file any specific, written objections, there are no portions of the R&R to which the Court must conduct a de novo

review. Accordingly, after review, the Court hereby adopts the Magistrate Judge's R&R as the Order of this Court, and it is

ORDERED that Defendant Brock's motion to dismiss (Entry 48) is granted, and Defendants Major, Nobles, and Rembert's motion for summary judgment (Entry 71) is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



The Honorable Sol Blatt, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

September 2
August 2, 2009
Charleston, South Carolina

#2